Declaratio Sententiae Matthiae Flaccii Illyrici de Originali peccato.

MDLXXII

The Declaration of Matthias Flacius Illyricus's Sentiment on Original Sin.

1572

Translated and Edited by
Luke Smith (2026)

The Declaration of Matthias Flacius Illyricus's Sentiment on Original Sin

2026, Luke Smith

This work is dedicated to the public domain (CC0) for the sake of the Gospel (Matt. 10:8). It may be shared, translated, and adapted, in whole or in part, without limit or permission. A digital copy of this work is available free of charge online.

https://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/deed.en

Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520-1575) is principally known for his staunch support of original sin as a substance, for which he was shuffled around Europe in the way of an exile. He was in many respects an orthodox and sincere evangelical Lutheran, yet the controversy that arose from his claim that original sin was not an accident tainted his teaching and damaged his reputation. The work translated here is one that Flacius wrote at the close of his career in 1572 and to which he gave the title *Declaratio Sententiae Matthiae Flaccii Illyrici de Originali peccato*.[1] It is a brief defense, in the format of a summary, of his teaching since that fatal dispute of 1560 when he first pronounced original sin as substance to defeat the Semi-Pelagianism of Strigel. It has been chosen because it serves nicely as a brief overview in Flacius' own words of his life and teaching.

I am not qualified to give the complete academic editing that his work demands and so have supplied only minimal footnotes at the points which are most critical to beginning engagement with Flacius and his sentiments. The *pius lector*, the devout reader, the designation so many of these 16th century writers usually employed, is encouraged to consult further scholarship to gain a fuller understanding of just how this troubled man ended up here in 1572. Two works to begin research with are F. Bente's "The Flacian Controversy" in the historical introductions in the *Concordia Triglotta*[2] and Luka Ilić's *Theologian of Sin and Grace*.[3]

[1] Images of the 1572 printing of this work are available at opendata2.uni-halle.de/handle/15165144120 12/902.

[2] Bente and Dau, eds. 1921. *Concordia Triglotta*. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House)

[3] Ilić, L. 2014. *Theologian of Sin and Grace: The Process of Radicalization in the Theology of Matthias Flacius Illyricus*. (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)

Declaratio Sententiae Matthiae Flaccii Illyrici de originali peccato.

Instant aliqui, ut me declarem, quid voce essentiae aut substantiae in disputatione de orig[inali] peccato velim. Respondeo, declaravi me saepius in editis scriptis copiose: et quidem etiam in illo primo tractatu, iam ante octennium conscripto, et ante sexennium impresso, in Clave secunda: Imo et in disputatione Vuinariensi iam ante annos duodecim. Hoc modo: ut sequitur.

Primum quod ista doctrina simul et locutio non sit mea, sed Lutheri instavratoris Evangelii Christi, imo Pauli et Christi, totiusque scripturae, quae essentialibus verbis utendo testatur, illam originem et thesaurum omnis mali, esse cor ipsum aut mentem pravum.

Praeterea quod per eam vocem non intelligam totam substantiam, individuum, aut personam hominis, ut adversarii me contra conscientiam calumniantur: sed tantum formam essentialem seu (ut scriptura loquitur) imaginem corrupti hominis: in qua nos ille corruptissimus, imo et in die inobedientiae in paradiso a satana spiritualiter intersectus Adamus genuit, Gen. 5. 1 Cor. 15. Idque potissimum in summo hominis gradu, qui a Theologis liberum arbitrium et spiritus mentis vocatur.

The Declaration of Matthias Flacius Illyricus's Sentiment on Original Sin.

Some people are pursuing me so that I would testify to what word, either essence or substance, I prefer in the disputation over original sin.[4] I answer: I have testified for myself many times in copious published writings: and, indeed, even in that first tract,[5] already written eight years ago, and printed six years ago, in the second *claves* [of my *Clavis Scripturae*], and really, in the Weimar disputation now already twelve years ago.[6] In this manner the rest follows.

First, that at the same time this teaching and phrasing is not mine, but of Luther the restorer of the Gospel of Christ, really of Paul and Christ, and all of scripture, which bear witness using essential words, that the very origin and repository of every evil is their own heart or crooked mind.

Moreover, that by this word I do not understand the entire substance, individual, or person of a man, as adversaries contrary to public fact misrepresent me: but such a formal essence or (as scripture says) image of corrupt man: in which we are the most corrupt;[7] really Adam also gave birth to [us] on that day of disobedience in paradise when we were spiritually cut off by Satan. Gen. 5. 1 Cor. 15. And that is especially [true] at the highest level of man which is called free will and a spiritual mind by the theologians.[8]

[4] The controversy Flacius became caught up in was over whether original sin was substance (*substantia*) or accident (*accidens*). Substance, as defined by Melanchthon, "is something which in reality has a being of its own and is not in another as having its being from the subject" (*Concordia Triglotta* 146. Henceforth "CT"). Accident, also as defined by Melanchthon, "is something which does not exist on its own nor is a part of the substance, but is changeable in something else" (CT 146, revised). The Church widely recognized that original sin was not a substance since it evoked Manichaean flavors. In 1570, after ten years of bitter arguing, Flacius agreed to Spangenberg of Mansfeld's suggestion that he no longer employ the word substance in his disputing, which he published in his *Brief Confession* of the same year. However, his original views were simply expressed with new words, causing no reconciliation. It is this state of the feud that Flacius is referring to.

[5] *De Peccati Originalis aut Veteris Adami Appellationibus et Essentia*

[6] The Weimar disputation of 1560 is where Flacius first declared that original sin was not an accident. His opponent, Strigel argued that because free will belongs to the substance of a man, it was not ever completely lost in the Fall and has a role in conversion, albeit possibly a limited one. In his zeal for denying Semi-Pelagianism, Flacius declared "Original sin is not an accident." When probed by Strigel, he replied "I have said that Scripture and Luther affirm that it is a substance" (CT 144).

[7] Flacius did not follow the standard definition of substance in his works, causing him additional unnecessary trouble and confusion. Instead, he differentiated between material and formal substance, the latter of which was "the image of God" later lost.

[8] Flacius did not hold that the matter of a man physically changed or that one had to be physically regenerated (hence "spiritually cut off"), but that the intellect, will, and affections are unable to be godly without the image of God.

Tertio, declaravi item me in eodem tractatu Clavis 2, et postea saepius, quod nullam plane creationem aut veram effectionem ullius aut essentiae aut accidentis, vel qualitatis positivae satanae tribuam, ut aliqui de me impudentissime finxerunt.

Third, I also testified in that same tract, *claves* 2, and more often afterwards, that I plainly give no creation or true accomplishment of either any essence or accident, or of positive quality to Satan, as some have construed me most impudently.[9]

Quarto, saepius testatus sum, quod damnem Manicheos furores omnes: qualis etiam est iste ipse, teste Augustino, vel praecipuus, quod aliqui negat in ista ruina hominis ex bono esse factum illud malum, per commutationem naturae: Sed esse istam tam praepotentem vim, regnantem in tot millibus, aut etiam milliaribus hominum et diabolorum, a malo illo daemone effectam, ceu venenum quoddam, toxicum, philtrum, vel stercus, et hominis naturae ab extra infusum, quod penetraverit et pervaserit infeceritque totum hominem, sicque reddiderit eum malum.

Fourth, I have often testified that I condemn all Manichean ravings: even the kind that is the very issue testified to by Augustine -- really the particular point [here]: that some deny that in the fall of man evil was made from good through a change of nature, but that there is a very strong power reigning in so many myriads, or even in millions of men and devils, accomplished by that evil Devil, like a particular poison, toxic, potion, or filth, infused from the outside into the nature of man, which has penetrated, pervaded, and corrupted the entire man, and thus he has rendered him evil.[10]

In hisce quidem ac similibus meis declarationibus pene infinities inculcatis in publicis scriptis, merito deberent et possent omnes acquiescere. Maioris tamen certitudinis causa, et ut maioribus istis gratificer, confiteor, testor et protestor, coram Deo et eius Ecclesia, me assentiri illi primo consensui, superiorianno facto, in norma, quam aliqui vocant Cerbestanam, olim ante annos duodecim Luneburgae comprobata, et ante 33 Schmalcaldiae, ac saepius alibi: nempe, sacris literis, tribus symbolis, Augustanae confessioni et Apoligiae, Schmalcaldis articulis, et Catechismo Lutheri: cui normae uti subscriberem, ministri Argen: et D. Iacobus Andreae postularunt.

Indeed, in these and similar declarations of mine, almost infinitely inculcated in public writings, all should and can rightly relax. Nevertheless, for greater cause of certainty, and so that I gratify those greater [men], I confess, testify, and assert in the sight of God and his Church, that I assent to that first confession made way back, which some call the Zerbst norm, formerly ratified at Lüneburg twelve years ago, and 33 years ago at Smalcald, and more often in other places: in Sacred Scripture, the three Symbols, the Augsburg Confession and Apology, Smalcald Articles, and Luther's Catechism, of course: to which rule the Strasbourg ministers and Dr. Jacob Andreae requested I subscribe to use.

In qua, praesertim in Apologia, diserte affirmatur de originali iusticia et iniusticia, quod illae sint ipsemet animi essentiales vires integrae vel corruptae, intellectus, voluntas et cor, quae illis tanquam praedicata tribuuntur.

In which, particularly in the Apology, concerning original righteousness and unrighteousness it is eloquently affirmed, that they are of themselves, intact or corrupted, essential powers of the soul (the intellect, the will, and the heart), which are considered by them as predicates.

Praeterea quod orig. peccatum, teste Augustino, sit concupiscentia, quam enim ipsa prava natura, quaerens non tantum carnales voluptates, sed etiam sapientiam et iustitiam carnalem, iisque bonis confidens, et contra, Deum eiusque iustitiam contemnens.

Moreover, that original sin, as Augustine testifies, is concupiscence, which, namely, is crooked nature itself, seeking not so much carnal desires, but even wisdom and righteousness of the flesh, confiding in those blessings and contempting God and his righteousness.[11]

[9] Hesshuius repeatedly accused Flacius of teaching that the Devil created substance in a letter of August 10, 1568, his *Analysis* of *ca.* 1570, and his *True Counter-Report* of 1571 (CT 149-150).

[10] The issue at hand here is whether original malice is a poison that was mixed in or poison itself (CT 147). Flacius denied that it was mixed in, corroborating his view of original sin as a substance.

[11] Apology II, 3

Sic et in Schmalcaldis articulis habetur, quod orig. peccatum sit contrarium illarum bonarum integrarumque animae virium, nempe depravatissime vires: ex quibus omnigena vitia, tanquam effectus orig. peccati ubertim profluant. Denique peccatum esse id totum, quicquid sumus.

And it is held in the Smalcald Articles that original sin is the antithesis of those initial blessings and the virtues of the soul, namely, the most crooked powers: from which every kind of vice gushes forth, as the result of original sin. And so, we are whatever sin is in every part.[12]

Testor item, me ex animo syncereque assentiri secundo eorundem ministrorum gravissimoque et sacrosancto consensui, sub finem Iunii anno superiori conscripto, et unanimiter subscripto, cui etiam me subscribere voluerunt, testatique sunt, esse perpetuam huius Ecclesiae doctrinam. In quo scripto diserte simul et solide ista ipsa presens controversia, de essentia originalis iniustitiae aut peccati, ex praedicta norma explicatur. Videat examinetque illam consensus formulam, quisvis studiosus veritatis lector. Digna sane est, quae ab omnibus legitur, pulchreque cum Buceri scriptis consentit. Volo enim meam sententiam secundum illam ipsam expositionem intelligi, illamque formulam mihi confessionis loco coram tota Dei Ecclesia esse. Neque enim, gratia Dei, temere, puerorum, aut etiam arundinum instar, huc atque illue, quavis aurula doctrinarum, per Methodias et Kybias, seductorum et inanis philosophiae fluctuo, modo aiens, modo negans: Modo scribens et subscribens formulas articulosque consensus, modo rursus eosdem abiiciens, ut multi alii, qui mutantur in horas: sicut tot, tamque horrenda experimenta hisce annis 26 a morte Lutheri, proh dolor nimium declararunt. Dominus me suo S. spiritu regat usque in finem.

Yet I testify that I, from my soul and sincerely, assent to the same ministers' second, most weighty, and sacred consensus, written at the end of June last year, and subscribed to unanimously, to which they even wanted me to subscribe to; they testify that it is the perpetual teaching of this Church, in which writing the current controversy itself over the essence of original unrighteousness or sin is eloquently and rigorously explained from previous standards. Whoever the studious reader of truth may be, let him consider and weigh that formula of consensus. It is truly worthy to be read by all and beautifully agrees with Bucer's writings. For I want my sentiment to be understood according to that very exposition and that formula to be in the sight of the entire Church of God in the place of a confession for me. For, by the grace of God, I do not blindly fluctuate like youths or even the image of reeds, [blown] here and there by whichever wind of doctrine through the method or trickery of seductors and inane philosophy, now affirming, now denying, now writing and now subscribing to formulas and articles of consensus, and later casting aside all of these, as many others who are changed like the hours: just as so many and such horrible experiences in these 26 years since the death of Luther have, oh it's too painful! declared. May the Lord direct me with his Holy Spirit all the way to the end.

Postremo etiam testor ac protestor, me assentiri quoque tertio illi consensui, elapsa aestate, decimo. Augusti, in fine Colloquii, inter me ac D.D. Iacobum Andreae et ipsos facto, Quod quidem fuit conclusio et veluti decretum finisque eius colloquii. Cuius summa sensusque est, Primum quod agnoscamus originale peccatum esse idipsum, quod S.S. vocat in scriptura veterem hominem, sensum carnis, cor lapideum, carnem, et quod similibus appellationibus aut locutionibus nominat: Secundo quod id, quod ad plenam explicationem et translationem controversiae huic deesset, amicis scriptis agere et tractare velimus, In utraque parte eius consensus et decreti illius Colloquii adhuc constanter persisto. Sequuntur:

Finally I even testify and bear witness that I also assent to that third consensus, last summer on the tenth day of August made at the end of the colloquy between me and Dr. Jacob Andreae and them, which really was the conclusion and, just like the decree and end of the colloquy. And whose summarized thought is: first, that we claim that original sin is complete, which the Holy Spirit calls the old man in scripture, the sense of the flesh, the heart of stone, the flesh, and which it gives similar names and phrases: Second that we want it [original sin] to be treated and dealt with in friendly writings, because there wants a full explanation and transfer of the controversy in this. In each part of the consensus and decree of that Colloquy I have constantly persisted up until now. There follow:

[12] Cf. Smalcald Articles, Part III, Art. I

Verba eius consensus conclusionis aut decreti, boni fide adscripta. Ex Chirographo eius pastoris, qui tum praesens illud Colloquium annotavi[t]. Dictata D. Iacobi Andreae. Peccatum originale, vetus homo, sensus carnis, caro, cor lapideum, et similia scripturae vocabula sunt synonyma, et significant peccatum originale.

The words of the conclusion or decree of the consensus, written down in good faith.

From the manuscript of their pastor, who, when present then at that Colloquy, recorded the sayings of Dr. Jacob Andreae:

Original sin, the old man, sense of the flesh, the flesh, the heart of stone, and similar scriptural words are synonyms, and mean original sin.

In fine quoque illarum annotationum sic habetur: Quod autem huius disputationi deest, scriptis animis supplebitur. Discessum autem est amice, hoc prius facto consensu, ut peccatum originale, vetus Adam, Sensus carnis, Caro, et Cor lapidem, et similia pro synonymis habeantur. Faxit Deus, ut hic consensus optatum quoque finem consequatur, Amen. Haec inde ad verbum.

Likewise, at the end of those annotations it is held: “However, what is omitted in this disputation, will be supplied in friendly writings. But the departure is friendly, with this previously formed consensus: that original sin, the old Adam, the Sense of the flesh, the Flesh, and a Heart of stone, and the like are considered synonyms. God made [these words] so that his wish and goal of consensus would be sought, Amen.” These are from there word for word.

In hac conclusione communi decreto aut consensu, ab ipsomet D. collocutore proprio ore dictato, sicut et in duobus prioribus, ego adhuc constanter persisto, verboque Dei id congruere statuo et cupio, originale peccatum istis ipsis synonymis scripturae vocibus, quibus id ipsemet spiritus S. in scriptura nominavit, nominari, quo in tam ardua re eum scriptura Deoque veraci non cum hominibus mendacibus sentiamus et loquamur.

In this communal conclusion, decree, or consensus (a dictation from the own mouth of the discussant himself) I consistently persist up to the present, just as in the previous two [consensuses], and I determine and desire that it agrees with the word of God: that original sin is mentioned with its scriptural synonyms, by which the Holy Spirit himself termed it, therefore we may feel and speak about it with truthful scripture and God, not with lying men.

Istam vero ipsam synonymiam originalis peccati, alioqui per sese euidentissimam, plurimi scriptores nostro tempore comprobarunt. Inter alios quidem etiam Bucerus, piae memoriae, in libro de Ratisbonensibus controversiis, pag. 42 et in libro de iustificatione 622 et 637.

Truly, besides being evident by itself, a great number of writers of our time have approved this very synonym for original sin. Indeed, even among them was Bucer, of blessed memory, in his book on the Regensburg controversies, p. 42, and in his book on justification, pp. 622 and 637.

In hoc triplici consensu, superiori anno expresse et indubitanter constituto, testor me etiamnum bona fide et pura conscientia persistere, et secundum eum velle meam hanc doctrinam et etiam vocem aut locutionem essentialis intelligi.

I have expressly and undoubtedly stood with this threefold consensus the past year; I testify that I even now persist in good faith and pure conscience, and, in line with that, that I even want also this, my doctrine, to be understood as the word or phrase essence.

Testatus quoque antea sum saepius editis scriptis, me si modo de re ipsa recte conveniat, sique mihi dentur aptiores locutiones, non esse cum quoquam pugnaturum de meis phrasibus, quas tamen non ego excogitavi, sed ex Luthero et scriptura ipsa sumpsi, unde etiam puritatem Evangelii Christi, una cum reliquis Christicolis didici. Fatentur enim etiam Antagonistae, scripturam essentialibus verbis,

Besides, previously I have often testified in published writings that, only if he correctly convenes me about the matter itself, and if more suitable words are handed over to me, I will not fight with anyone over my phrases, which I did not even come up with, but adopted from Luther and scripture itself, from which I learned the pure Gospel of Christ – [as] one along with the other Christians. For even

phrasibus et sententiis, originalem iustitiam et iniustitiam describere.

Quo vero minus videar aliquid vel maliciose occultare, vel novi moliri, et quo istis meis monitoribus tanto plenius satifaciam, adiungam attemperaboque meam sententiam etiam aliis receptis probatisque scriptis.

Affirmo igitur me ista locutione et sententia de essentialitate orig: peccati idem plane velle exprimere, quod in confessione Vuertebergica eiusque Apologia habetur: Sicut plenius in latina confessione pag. 532 et etiam in Germanica, adscriptis etiam utriusque testimoniis locisque indicavi.

Illa igitur confessio primum affirmat, iustitiam orig: esse, quod homo ipse sit initio conditus, iustus, sapiens, liberoque arbitrio praeditus: et esse illam tantam animi integritatem viresque naturales adeo bonas, ut homo illis potuerit recte servire Deo: Contrarium vero esse iniustitiam, aut peccatum orig: Quid autem aliud est hominem esse creatum aut formatum, sapientem et libero arbitrio praeditum, eiusque vires naturales adeo potentes et efficaces fuisse, quam illa ipsa eius talis optima forma aut imago essentialis, in qua primum est a suo creatore effigiatus, Contrarias vero vires ostendit esse orig: peccatum.

Postea eadem ex scriptura docet et probat, hominem adeo esse corruptum et plane mortuum, ut prorsus nihil boni posit. Verba eius haec sunt, Cum essetis mortui delictis ac peccatis, in quibus aliquando ambulastis iuxta seculum mundi huius, iuxta principem etc. Et mox, Eramus natura filii irae, quemadmodum et caeteri. Mortui, inquit, peccatis et filii irae, hoc est, alieni a gratia Dei. Sicut autem homo corporaliter MORTUUS, non potest se suis viribus praeparare aut convertere ad accipiendam VITAM corporalem, Ita mortuus spiritualiter non potest sese sua virtute convertere ad accipiendam vitam spiritualem.

Tertio, illa etiam contrarias, pessimas vir naturamque perpetuo adversam homini adscribit, affirmans eum esse

the Antagonists admit that scripture describes original righteousness and unrighteousness with essential words, phrases, and sentences.

Which is why, truly, lest I seem to let something be lacking or to hide it maliciously, and to abundantly satisfy them, my monitors, I will join and adjust my sentiment to even the other accepted and proven writings.

I affirm, therefore, that by that phrase and sentiment about the essentiality of original sin I plainly want to imitate what is held in the Württemberg Confession and its Apology:[13] just as I indicated more clearly in the Latin confession, p. 532, and even in the German one, the testimonies and topics for both appended.

Consequently that first confession affirms that original righteousness is what man himself was at the initial establishment -- just, wise, gifted with free will -- and that it is such a soundness of soul and natural powers (rather, blessings), so that man was able to rightly serve God with these; truly, it is the opposite of unrighteousness or original sin. Yet what else is it that man was created or formed wise, and gifted with free will, and his natural powers were so potent and effective, than that optimal essential form or image of his itself, in which he is first fashioned by his creator? Truly, it shows that the opposite is original sin.

After this it teaches and proves from scripture that man is so corrupt and clearly dead, that he is entirely unable to do good. Its words are: "Since you all are dead in offense and sin, in which you all sometimes walked like the age of this word, like the first [man], etc." And next: "By nature we are sons of wrath, in one and the other ways." "Dead," it says, "sons of sin and wrath," that is, aliens of the grace of God. Yet just as a man **dead** in body, is not able to prepare or turn himself by his powers to accept **life** in body, so too is the dead in spirit not able to turn himself by his power to accept the spiritual life.

Third, it even states the opposite: man is the worst and that nature is perpetually the adversary of man, affirming that

[13] Melanchthon and Johannes Brenz composed additional material to the Augsburg Confession in 1551 for the discussion at the Council of Trent. It is also called the *Confessio Saxonica* (Saxon Confession) and the *Repetitio confessionis Augustanae* (Repetition of the Augsburg Confession). The Latin text of the Württemberg Confession (*Confessio Virtembergica*) may be found at https://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/view/bsb00010188?page=%2C1. Various editions of its Apology may also be found at *Münchener DigitalisierungsZentrum Digitale Bibliothek* (e.g. https://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/view/bsb10167099?page=%2C1).

natura filium irae, et hostem Dei, Imo etiam citat Augustinum dicentem tractat 49. in Iohan: Nemo se palpet: De suo SATANAS est, de Dei beatus est. Quid enim est de suo, nisi peccato suo. En audis hominem de suo esse non tantum peccatum. Sed etiam SATANAM. Postremo eadem peccatum orig: tum definit, tum etiam rem ipsam, quidnam sit, suo vero nomine indicat, inquiens, ut sequitur.

he is by nature a son of wrath, and enemy of God; Really, it refers to Augustine's 49th tract on John: Let No one flatter himself. His is **Satan**; God's is blessed. For what is "his" except his sin? Look! You hear that regarding what is his, man is not just sin, but even **Satan**. Finally, at that time it [the passage] defines the same original sin; even then it proclaims the thing itself, whatever it may be, by its true name, saying, as follows:

Ad Rom: 7. Video aliam legem in membris meis, repugnantem legi mentis meae, et captivum reddentem me legi peccati, quae est in membris meis. Hic loquitur Paulus de peccato remanente post Baptismum: et affirmat illud repugnare legi mentis suae, hoc est, affectui Spiritus sancti. Quod autem repugnat spiritui sancto certo reipsa vere peccatum sit necesse est. Nam haec est NATURA peccati, ut pugnet cum Spiritu sancto. Ad Gal. 5. Caro concupiscit adversus Spiritum, et Spiritus adversus carnem. Haec enim inter se mutuo adversantur, ut non quecunque volueritis, eadem faciatis. Hic iterum loquitur Paulus de peccato remanente post Baptismum, et TRIBUIT ei manifeste NATURAM peccati, videlicet concupiscere adversus spiritum, et adversari spiritui, ac impedire, ne perfecta iusticia in homine fiat.

Rom. 7: "I see a different law in my members, fighting with the law of my intellect and rendering me a captive to the law of sin which is in my members." Here Paul is speaking about sin remaining after Baptism and he affirms that the former fights back with the law of his intellect, that is, the disposition of the Holy Spirit. Yet what fights back with the Holy Spirit certainly, by the very matter itself, truly has to be sin. For this is the **nature** of sin, so that it fights with the Holy Spirit. Gal. 5: The flesh passionately pulls against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh. For these are opposed to one another in mutuality, so that whatever you all want, you all do not do the same. Here again Paul speaks about sin remaining after Baptism and manifestly **attributes** the **nature** of sin to it, obviously, that it passionately pulls against the spirit and is opposed to the spirit and impedes it, for fear that he bring about perfect righteousness in man.

Hic clare audis tum definitionem peccati, quod sit omne id quod pugnat cum Spiritu S. et lege: tum etiam nomen ipsum aut potius rem ipsam peccati istius, nempe carnem consupiscentem contra Spiritum. Habes igitur et definitionem et nomen rei, quae est peccatum originale.

Here you clearly hear then the definition of sin which is everything which fights with the Holy Spirit and the Law: but even its very name, or rather, the matter itself regarding sin, namely, flesh passionately pulling against the Spirit. Therefore, you have both a definition and name for the thing, which is original sin.

Hoc ergo ipsum volo sentioque, originale peccatum esse ipsammet carnem concupiscentem et militantem contra Spiritum et legem Dei, quam scriptura etiam pravum Cor, mentem caecam, et veterem Adamum solet nominare.

Therefore I want and feel that original sin itself is the very flesh which is pulling and militant against the Spirit and God's Law, which scripture, yet again, is accustomed to name the crooked heart, the darkened mind, and the Old Adam.

Sic et Apologia eiusdem confessionis idem iteratis vicibus affirmat: inquit enim, Sciamus quod Natura peccati habeat duplicem considerationem. Una est quod pugnet cum Spiritu sancto et lege Dei: Altera est, quae faciat homines coram Deo reos et damnet eos. Horum sane utru[m]que convenit huic ipsi corruptissimae essentiae hominis, nempe cordi lapideo, sensui carnis, carni, animali homini, caecae perversaeque menti, Naturae nostrae, et toti veteri Adamo, ut ex scriptura notissimum est.

Also the Apology of the same confession affirms the same by repeated replies, for it says: "We know that the nature of Sin has a two-fold consideration. One is that it fights with the Holy Spirit and the Law of God; the other is that which makes men offenders in the sight of God and condemns them." And of these, reasonably either one convenes upon this very thing of the most corrupt essence of man, namely, upon a heart of stone, sense of the flesh, the flesh, the animal of man, a darkened and perverse mind, our nature,

and upon the entire old Adam, as is most well-known from scripture.

Voce natura corrupta saepius Oecolampadius regnans illud peccatum Rom. 7. nominat et interpretatur. Vide ibi. Eadem locutione natura corrupta definivit orig: peccatum etiam Vuigandus ac Iudex in Corpore doctrinae Apostol: Saepius recu[r]so et reviso.

Frequently Oecolampadius names and interprets that authoritative sin in Rom. 7 as the term corrupt nature. Look there. Even Wigand and Judex define the same by the phrase "corrupted nature" in the Body of the Teaching of the Apostles: I frequently refer[14] to and revisit [it].

Utilia eadem etiam Bucerus in libris contra Pighium: Lutherus quoque in argumento et scoliis super Roma: et alibi passim in suis libris coniungens, *Natur und Wesen*. Naturam et Essentiam.

Even Bucer [has] the same useful things in his books against Pighius; similarly, Luther in the argument and scholia on Rome [*Roma*], and connected elsewhere throughout his books, [has] *Natur und Wesen*: Nature and Essence.

Praeterea et Augustinus ipse non raro facit, naturam ipsam fontem omnium actualium peccatorum, praesertim lib: de Civit: Dei 22. Cap. 22. et epistola 106. et lib: 4. contra Iul: Denique libro de civitate Dei 15. cap. 7. impresse et copiose exponit istud originale et dominans peccatum Rom. 7. de ipsorum carne concupiscente.

Furthermore, also Augustine himself does not rarely make nature itself the fount of all actual sin, particularly *City of God* 22, ch. 22 and Letter 106 and Book 4 *Against Julian*. Finally, in *City of God* 15, ch. 7 he impressively and eloquently puts forth that original and dominating sin of Rom. 7 regarding those persons' carnal concupiscence.

Imo et ipsa Apologia orig: peccatum de ipsis essentialibus potentiis exponit: dicitque esse illam pravam naturam: quae non modo concupiscat carnalesvoluptates, sed etiam sapientiam et iusticiam carnalem, iisque bonis confidat, et Deum eiusque sapientiam contemnat.

Indeed, the very Apology also puts forth original sin in light of the essential powers: and says that it is that crooked nature which does not just ardently pull for carnal delight, but even carnal wisdom and justice, and trusts in those blessings, and holds God and his wisdom in contempt.

Probantur quoque mihi illae locutiones et phrases, quibus utitur Corpus doctrinae Apostolicae, in definitione orig: peccati, videlicet, quod sit NATURA corrupta, qua phrasi aut genere in istius mali descriptionibus multi praestantes doctores hactenus usi sunt, inter quos etiam Lutherus, Philippus, Bucerus, et Brentius, Oecopamladius, ut liquide cernere est in Oecolampadii super Romanos 7. Vide ibi.

Those sayings and phrases, which the Body of Apostolic Teaching uses in the definition of original sin, are also approved by me, namely, that it is a corrupt **nature**, which phrase or classification many outstanding doctors up until today have used in descriptions of that evil, among whom are even Luther, Philip, Bucer, Brenz, and Oecolampadius, as is fluidly discerned in Oecolampadius' [work] on Romans 7. Look there.

Probantur quoque mihi illae phrases, quibus D. Iacobus Andreae, anto annos undecim, in illasua luculenta concione, Augustae habita, in describendo originali peccato usus est, nempe *Bild Angesicht Ebenbild Anblick schiemen sehen gleich dem Teufel Natur Art verkerte Natur larue des Satans ein feindseeliges jemmerliches elendig hesslichs und abschenlichs Bild das nichs gutes rechtschaffenes oder gesundes an dem Menschen ist. Denn wenn Gott den Menschen nach dem fall in seiner verkerten Natur ansiehet ist er ime in seinen Augen ein Grewel*

Those phrases are also approved by me, which Dr. Jacob Andreae used, 11 years prior, in his splendid sermon held at Augsburg, in describing original sin, namely: *Bild Angesicht Ebenbild Anblick schiemen sehen gleich dem Teufel Natur Art verkerte Natur larue des Satans ein feindseeliges jemmerliches elendig hesslichs und abschenlichs Bild das nichs gutes rechtschaffenes oder gesundes an dem Menschen ist. Denn wenn Gott den Menschen nach dem fall in seiner verkerten Natur ansiehet ist er ime in seinen Augen ein Grewel worden. Item wenn uns der Teufel unser*

[14] The Latin text has *recuso* ("I object"), which does not make sense in this context. Instead, I suggest that *recurso* ("I return to") may have been the intended wording and render this with "refer."

worden. Item wenn uns der Teufel unser seindseelig heslich elendes runtzels altgefersens auffetziges grindiges Angesicht in dem Spiegel des Gesetzes Gottes zeiget und fürhelt das wir mit dieser heslichen schiemen nicht in Himmel kommen können. Item ich bekenne das ich mit diesem heslichen Angesicht so ich am Leib und Seele von meiner Mutter auff die Erde bracht habe nicht vermag in Himmel zukommen.

Sed quomodo istae tam grandes, et significantes, emphaticaeque descriptiones originalis peccati significent tantum unicum aliquod vitium, habitum, et potentiam aut morbum, seu unicum accidens essentiae, quae tota incolumis integraque in materia et forma permanserit, ut initio est condita: id sane minime videre possum, ut copiosius ostendi sub finem utriusque confessionis.

Sic quoque probatur mihi, quod eiusdem canicularis disputatio dicit, hominis essentiales potentias intellectum et voluntatem, esse corruptissimas, pessimas, et Deo adversas, Hominem ipsum esse quidem initio ad imaginem Dei creatum: Sed postea horribiliter corruptum, et in Satanae imaginem transformatum. Adhaec quodilla corruptio humanae nautrae sit miserabilis et horribilis quaedam deformatio: propter quam a planta pedis usque ad verticem capitis, nihil sit in universa hominis Natura sanum, sive virescorporis, sive animae potentias consideres, Quod item illa humanae naturae corruptio mentem hominis in rebus coelestibus non modo caliginosam reddiderit, sed etiam prorsus excaecaverit. Ulterius quod voluntas animae potentia substantialis ita corrupta, et prius depravata est, ut in rebus spiritualibus non solum nihil boni velit: sed etiam tantum malum velit ac eligat. Denique quod hanc mentis caecitatem et voluntatis a bono ad malum conversionem sequatur contumacia omnium virium corporis et animae: quae legi divinae semper adversetur. In summa quod hominis essentiales vires sint in rebus quidem terrenis semiabolitae et semimortuae, sed in rebus motibus que spiritualibus plane caecae et mortuae, eoque necessario a Christo resuscitandae per vivificationem, themate, 24. 25. et 30. Haec omnia sunt ipsius disputationis verba sententiaeque.

seindseelig heslich elendes runtzels altgefersens auffetziges grindiges Angesicht in dem Spiegel des Gesetzes Gottes zeiget und fürhelt das wir mit dieser heslichen schiemen nicht in Himmel kommen können. Item ich bekenne das ich mit diesem heslichen Angesicht so ich am Leib und Seele von meiner Mutter auff die Erde bracht habe nicht vermag in Himmel zukommen.

But how do those so great, significant, and emphatic descriptions of original sin mean only some single vice, state, power or illness, or a single accident of the essence, which endured completely unharmed and untouched in matter and form, as it was created in the beginning: this I am able to reasonably see at least, as I more fully showed after the end of each confession.

And what that canicular disputation[15] of the same says is approved by me: that the essential powers, intellect, and will of man are most corrupt, the worst, and adverse to God; that Man himself is indeed made in the image of God at the start, but was later horribly corrupted, and transformed into the image of Satan. Add to these that corruption of human nature which is a particular miserable and horrible deformation: on account of which nothing -- from the sole of the foot right to the top of the head -- in the entire Nature of man is healthy, whether you all consider corporeal powers or soulful powers; likewise, that that corruption of human nature has rendered the mind of a man is not just foggy in heavenly matters, but has even entirely blinded it. What's more: that the will, the substantial power of the soul, is thus corrupted and was previously depraved so that in spiritual matters it not only desires nothing good but even wants and chooses much evil. Finally, that the stubbornness of all the powers of the body and soul (which are always averse to the divine law) follows this blindness of the mind and will, an inversion from good to bad. In summary, that the essential powers of man are indeed partly abolished and partly dead in terrestrial matters, but in matters of stirring and of the spirit are plainly blind and dead, and consequently it is necessary to be reawakened by Christ through vivification. (In the 24th, 25th, and 30th topic.) All these are the words and sentences of his own disputation.

[15] *canicularis disputatio*. That is, the disputation that occurred during the Dog Days (of summer), those associated with the Dog Star, Sirius.

Haec iam declarandae sententiae, simul et fidei meae causa hic adscribere volui: ut confiterer, te starer, ac protestarer, coram Deo et eius Ecclesia, me plane nihil novi moliri, nullamque peregrinam nostrique Ecclesiis inusitatam doctrinam, in eas invehere conari, multoque minus cogitare nefandos Manichaeorum furores de Cacodaemone conditore istius tam praepotentis mali et efficacis potentiae, ac infusore eius in humanam naturam, cuius participatione et admixtione homines sint facti mali, et Augustinus Manichaeorum sententiam saepissime exprimit, Presertim autem libro primo contra Iulianum, quem errorem nunc quidam adversarii propalam sectantur, ut aeditis libellis hactenus copiosus, nec ipsis quidem contradicere valentibus ostendi. Haec quidem hactenus de meae fidei sententiaeque declaratione dicere volui. Quod autem attinet ad voluntatem studiumque meum concordiae cum omnibus recte sententibus et Ecclesiae Christi membris, novit id ille inspector cordium Deus: Testantur id etiam tot meae supplices preces, ad potentes et doctos, de pia fraternaque cogitatione controversiarum. Denique idem liquido tot meae cruces testari possunt. Peto vicissim pacem et preces a fratribus.

Dominus Iesus nos suo spiritu regat, tollatque ex sua Ecclesia omnia scandala et errores suamque Evangelii veritate ac puritate, paulo ante veluti postliminio, post tot saeculorum plusquam Aegyptias tenebras Antichristi et Sophistarum, per suum tertium Eliam Luth: restitutam illustratamque, diutius et usque in finem in columen, ob promissam misericordiam et veritatem suam, conservet, Amen.

I wanted to simultaneously write these declaratory sentiments and the reason of my faith now so that I might confess, withstand you, and profess, before God and his Church, that I plainly do not labor at anything novel, nor that I am trying to import something foreign or an unusual teaching into our Church, and much less that I have in mind the wicked ravings of the Manichaeans about the Evil Demon, the founder of that so very powerful evil and efficacious power, and its infuser into human nature, by whose participation and interaction men are made evil, and Augustine most frequently documents the sentiment of the Manichaeans, especially in his first book of *Conta Iulianum*, whose error certain adversaries now openly pursue, as shown very plentifully up until now in published booklets, nor, indeed, that they strongly contradict them. Indeed, up until now I wanted to say this about my faith and declaration of sentiments. However, that which pertains to my will and zeal for concord with all the sentiments and members of the Church of Christ, God, the inspector of hearts, knows it: Even my many supplicate prayers to the powerful and the learned for an affectionate and fraternal reflection of the controversies testify this. Finally, my numerous crosses are able to fluidly testify the same. I seek again peace and prayers from brothers.

May the Lord Jesus rule us with his spirit, and root out from his Church all temptations and errors, and may he preserve on account of his promised mercy and truth the truth and purity of his Gospel, a little earlier restored and illuminated through his third Elijah, Luther, as if by a right to return home, after so many ages of more than Egyptian darkness of the Antichrist and Sophists, for a long while and up until the end at the summit.